THE
LIGHT OF TRUTH
— OR —
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, **1897.**

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, AUGUST 1898.** | **No. 3.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 30.)

(*Objection*):—If it be held that it is Brahman mentioned in the opening passage who is spoken of as manomaya etc., the reference to jîva who is mentioned incidentally would serve no purpose.

(*Answer*). The Sûtrakâra says :—

And because of the appropriateness of the qualities intended to be taught. (I. ii.2.)

Since the qualities intended to be taught,—namely, that He is of unfailing will, that from Him all desires proceed,—can be applied only to Brahman, He alone is the object to be worshipped. And jîva who is incidentally mentioned is the worshipper, there being a necessity for the supply of that factor to complete the injunction.

Adhikarana. 2.

In the last adhikarana it has been shewn that jîva in general cannot be an object of worship but that he can be only a worshipper. Now again, the next section proceeds to establish that even Nârâyana, who is the upâdâna or material cause of the Hiranyagarbha, the aggregate of all jîvas, is only a worhipper of Brahman who is above all universe, but not an object of worship.

Owing to incongruity, the embodied is not (meant) (I. ii. 3).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Mahopanishad :

" The Lord of the universe, the A'tman, the I's'vara, the Eternal, the Good, the Indestructible, Nârâyana, the Great one who was to be known," and so on.

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is the embodied entity, or the Parames'vara, or some one else, who is spoken of as Nârâyana and described as the Lord of the universe and so on.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It is Nârâyana, the embodied entity, who is spoken of as the Lord of the universe, firstly because Nârâyana, the embodied entity, is repeated as the subject, of whom thousand-headedness etc. are

to be predicated, in the section beginning with. "The thousand-headed Deity," * secondly because of his characteristic marks—such as lying in the ocean—spoken of in the section; thirdly because of the use of the synonymous terms, *Achyuta, Hari* applicable to him alone.

Siddhânta, however, maintains that it is Mahes'vara, the Supreme Lord, the A'tman of Nârâyana—How? Because such attributes of Parames'vara as the lordship of the whole universe cannot be applied to any other being such as Nârâyana. Lordship of the whole universe is predicated of the Parames'vara alone by repetition in the words "to Him who is the Lord of cattle, the Lord of trees, the Lord of the worlds,...... I salute." † That no other being than Rudra is the Lord of the universe is declared by the following passage:

"One verily is Rudra,—they are not for a second,—who rules these worlds by the powers of ruling"‡

And the s'ruti "Rudra is high above the universe"§ teaches that it is Rudra who is high above the universe. Wherefore it is but right to say that the Being spoken of as the Lord of the universe is the Parames'vara, the A'tman of Nârâyana.

(*Objection*):—To speak of Him as the Self of Nârâyana is to imply that Parames'vara is the *Antaryâmin* or the Inner Regulator of Nârâyana: which is not right. In the words "Nârâyana is the Supreme Brahman," the s'ruti declares that Nârâyana is the Supreme Brahman. Then the passage beginning with "like unto the lotus-bud" speaks of Purusha as located in the heart-lotus; then jîva is described in the passage beginning with "in its midst is the flame of fire", and then in the words "in the middle of that flame is the Paramâtman established," Nârâyana is spoken of as the Paramâtman, as the Antaryâmin or Inner Regulator of the jîva. Thus, we see that He (Nârâyana) is the object of worship. The passage "He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva" and so on declares that Brahmâ, S'iva and other beings are His vibhûtis or glorious emanations. Wherefore Nârâyana Himself is the Lord of the universe, the very Supreme Brahman, and is to be worshipped as the Antaryâmin or Inner Regulator of jîvas. It is therefore unjust to

* Mahanarayana Upanishad.

† Taittirîya—Samhitâ 4—5.

‡ S'vetâsvatara Upanishad 3—2.

§ Maha. Upa. 10.

hold that the Parames'vara is Nârâyana's A'tman, and that as such He is above Nârâyana and to be worshipped by Him.

In reply the Sûtrakâra says:—

Because of their mention as the object and the agent. (I. ii. 4.)

There, the Parames'vara and Nârâyana are mentioned respectively as the worshipped and the worshipper, as the object and the agent.—How?—The passage "like unto the lotus-bud" describes the heart of Nârâyana who has been just spoken of; and the passage "Paramâtman is established" declares that the Parames'vara who is himself the Paramâtman is the object of worship as dwelling within Nârâyana. Thus, Nârâyana is spoken of as the agent, as the worshipper; and Parames'vara as the object, as worthy of being worshipped. Wherefore the Paramâtman who is to be worshipped is some being other than Nârâyana. The passage "He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva" and so on teaches that Parames'vara manifests His own glory in the form of the universe comprising Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Indra and the like. Though Vishnu is not mentioned here (as the Parames'vara's vibhûti), He is mentioned as such in the Kaivalya Upanishad. After speaking of the heart-lotus, the upanishad says:

"Him whose help-mate is Umâ, who is the Supreme Lord, who is Mighty, Three-eyed, Dark-necked and serene; having meditated thus, the sage reaches Him who is the womb of all beings, the witness of all, transcending Tamas. He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva, He is Indra, He the Indestructible, the Supreme, the self-luminous. He Himself is Vishnu, He is Prâna, He is Time, "He is Fire, He the Moon," and so on.

The same principle should be applied here. The following passage from the Atharva-upanishad should also be taken into consideration:

"That Lord who is Known as Rudra, He is Bhûh, Bhuvah, Suvah as well as he who is known as Brahmâ; to Him we bow. That Lord who is known as Rudra, He is Bhuh, Bhuvah, Suvah as well as he who is known as Vishnu to Him we bow. That Lord......... as well as he who is known as Mahes'vara,............" and so on

The omission of Vishnu between Brahmâ and S'iva in the passage quoted from Mahopanishad is to be accounted for by the fact that Vishnu has been spoken of as the worshipper. Hence no mutual contradiction among these passages.

(*Objection*):—The Being (Purusha) spoken of in the Purusha-sûkta which begins with "Thousand-headed is Purusha" is said to be endued with a world forming a part of Himself, as declared in the s'ruti "A foot of His do all these creatures form." The same Being is treated of here—in the passage under discussion—under the name "Nârâyana." The same Being is designated by the name Brahman in the passage "Nârâyana. is the Supreme Brahman." Indeed it is Brahman who is to be worshipped by all. How can it be that such a Being is the worshipper of another?

The Sûtrakâra answers the objection as follows:

Owing to the specific word (I. ii. 5).

The specific text "Brahman is above Nârâyana" declares that Brahman is higher than Nârâyana. Wherefore the Supreme Brahman who is distinct from Nârâyana is to be worshipped, inasmuch as the Parabrahman Himself puts on the form of the thousand-headed Purusha and forms the upâdâna or material cause of the universe. In II. 23 we shall show that Nârâyana, having Parabrahman for his A'tman or the Impeller, assumes the form of the universe.

The sûtrakâra adduces another sort of evidence to prove that Nârâyana is an upâsaka or worshipper:

And because of smriti. (I. ii. 6).

From the following passage of the smriti,

"Having thus spoken, then, O King, Hari, the great Lord of Yoga, showed to the son of Prithâ the Supreme Form of I's'vara."*

it is evident that Nârâyana, the great Master of Yoga is engaged in Yoga or samâdhi, *i. e.*, in the contemplation of Parames'vara, the Supreme Lord. Bearing on this subject there is the following speech of the Parames'vara addressed to As'vatthâman:

"I am duly worshipped; by Krishna who is unwearied in action; therefore none else exists who is dearer to me than Krishna."

Wherefore the Supreme Brahman who is to be worshipped is different from Nârâyana.

The sûtrakâra again raises an objection and refutes it:

If (you hold it is) not (so) because of His having a small abode and being so designated, (we say) no; He is so (designated) because He is to be worshipped; and He is like a'ka's'a. (I. ii. 7).

(*Objection*): The Being here spoken of cannot be the Parames'vara who is all-pervading, since the former is described in the following passage as dwelling within the small flame of fire and so having a small resting-ground and is denoted by terms implying smallness:

"There is (a streak of light) which is as fine as the bristle of a Nîvâra grain, which is yellow in colour, the standard of things that are fine: Within that flame does Paramâtman abide."

(*Answer*):—Not so. He is so designated because He is here described as an object of worship. Not that He is small in himself; for it requires no proof that He is infinite in Himself, like the âkâs'a which when conditioned by an upâdhi such as a jar is said to be small, and which is said to be infinite when regarded in itself. Hence no inconsistency.

Again the sûtrakâra raises an objection and answers it:

If (you say that this) necessitates enjoyment, (we say) no, because there is a difference. (1. ii. 8).

(*Objection*): It is the same Being spoken of as higher than Nârâyana and therefore as the object of worship is the Being described as "Honest and True, the Supreme Brahman, the Purusha dark and brown, whose semen is held above, of divers eyes"* and so on. Here the Parabrahman is described as *dark and brown* because of His being tinged with Mâyâ, the Supreme S'akti or Power; He is described as one '*whose semen is held above*' because of His having Fire for His semen: He is '*of divers eyes*' because of His having three eyes: He is *Purusha* because He lies in the lotus of Dahara, the âkâs'a in the heart; He is "*Honest and True*" because in him there is no inconsistency between speech and thought. Wherefore as possessed of a form containing three eyes, etc. He is subject to enjoyment of pleasures and pains pertaining to the body.

(*Answer*):—No, because there is a difference. There exists, indeed, a difference between Brahman's body and the bodies of jîvas, which latter are meant for the enjoyment of pleasure and the suffering of pain; for, He has assumed the body at His own will, whereas their bodies have been brought into existence by their respective *Karma*. Wherefore the s'ruti describes Parames'vara as "free from sin, free from old age, free from death and grief, from hunger and thirst, desiring nothing but what He ought to desire, and imagining nothing but what He ought to imagine,"†

* Bhagavadgîtâ. 11-9.

* Mahanarayana Upanishad 11-

† Chhandogya-Upanishad 8-7.

and thus devoid of the attributes pertaining to the body of a samsârin. But not so is jîva, the samsârin. Therefore it is that in the passages like "with perfect limbs He is many-formed and fierce,"* the Parames'vara's voluntarily assumed forms of great beauty —the divine forms which are free from sin, old age, death, grief and so on—are declared to be perfect and eternal. Wherefore, the Parabrahman, the Supreme Lord, being different from jîva, He cannot be tinged with any of the defects pertaining to the body. The *Upakrama* and other test-passages point to the conclusion that the divers-eyed Brahman is the highest of all and is the Being who ought to be worshipped. To explain : in the Upakrama or opening passage beginning with "Subtler than the subtle,"† the Lord has been described to be a very glorious being, as dwelling in the caves of the hearts of all creatures, as also being cognized by that person who, by the great Grace of the Lord, has been freed from all grief. Again in the passage "the seven prânas arise from Him" the same Being endued with the Supreme Sakti is described as the upâdâna or material cause of the universe which is composed of prâna etc. Then in the passage, "That great sage, Rudra, who was the first, before all gods, above all universe, saw the Hiranyagarbha being born," He is referred to as the cause, as being above all universe, as being omniscient, as being the generator of the Hiranyagarbha, the first of all emanations. The same Being, dwelling in the cave of the Supreme A'kâs'a, is described to be attainable as the Supreme Immortal Being by those aspirants who perform all acts without longing for fruits, who know the drift of the Vedânta, who have subdued their senses. Then as the question arises as to the way by which to reach Him, contemplation in Dahara is recommended. There it has been said—but only in a general way—that the Being who dwells in the lotus of *Dahara* ought to be worshipped. Then the question arising as to who that Being is, the s'ruti says that it is He who is the Supreme Being called Mahâdeva. Then again the question arises as to what His form is ; and in answer to this question the s'ruti concludes by saying that He is possessed of a form containing divers eyes and so on. Nârâyana who is incidentally mentioned in the chapter referred to should be construed as the worshipper, on the principle explained in the preceding adhikarana. Though all have to worship Parames'vara, Nârâyana is specially mentioned here, because he is the highest of the worshippers. We can justify the description of Nârâyana here by Brahman's attributes,—regarding Nârâyana the worshipper as not distinct from the divers-eyed Brahman, the object of worship,—on the ground that it is a description of Nârâyana who is the upâdâna or material cause of the universe and who is ensouled by Him, the Supreme Brahman.

* Rik-Samhita 2-7-17.

† Mahanarayana-Upanishad 10.

Adhikarana.—3.

(He is) the Devourer, because of the mention of the moving and the unmoving. (I. ii. 9.)

The passage which is to be discussed here occurs in the Kathopanishad and reads as follows :—

> "Who then knows where He is, He to whom the Brâhmanas and Kshatriyas are (as it were) but food, and death itself a condiment ?"*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Being who is described as the devourer of the whole universe of sentient and insentient existence—which is referred to by the mention of Brâhmanas and Kshatriyas and which forms as it were a morsel of food mixed with the condiment of death—is the Parames'vara or some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—The highly Merciful and all-Gracious Being cannot be the devourer of all. It is cruel to put an end to other's lives. Anger is the sprout from which springs up the act of cruelty. The root of anger which is an evil passion is none other than Moha or delusion. The cause of delusion which is the source of all destruction is *Tamas*. Wherefore the devourer of all is a Tâmasic Being. Tâmasic nature consists in being devoid of all light, the light of knowledge etc. being enshrouded by Tamas, the darkness of ignorance. To speak of Brahman as the destroyer of all is to attribute ignorance, darkness, delusion, anger and other evil qualities to Him who is ever pure, who is the repository of unmixed good, who is free from all taint of samsâra. Then such attributes, as omniscience and ever-contentedness, which have been conclusively shown to form the characteristic marks of His essential nature, would be meaningless. Therefore some other being distinct from Brahma and possessed of the attributes referred to must be the destroyer.

(*Siddhânta*) :—It is Brahman who is spoken of as the all-destroyer.—Why ?—Because of the mention o

* Kathopanishad. 2-25.

the moving and the unmoving. As to the contention that it is not right to regard Brahman as the devourer of the whole universe of moving and unmoving objects, we say that that very description marks the characteristic nature of Brahman, inasmuch as a Jîva who is of limited powers has not got the power of destroying all the moving and unmoving objects. "To that Destroyer, to that great Devourer, I bow," thus is Parames'vara described in the Atharvas'iras as the all-destroyer never is a Jîva so spoken of. "Who all these worlds sacrificed,"* thus Brahman is described as offering all the worlds as an oblation in the fire of His own Light. A Jîva who is classed as an oblation can never possess this power. When the Supreme Lord remains alone, having absorbed into Himself the whole universe, everything other than Himself, moving or unmoving, sentient or insentient, then all luminaries such as the sun and the moon being absent, all division of time into day and night being done away with, all forms and names having disappeared, all this universe remains as mere Tamas (darkness), there being no perception of gross and subtile objects, of men, Devas, or other beings. Even then remains He alone, the Supreme Lord, of infinite Light, the Witness of all. Accordingly the s'ruti says,

"When the light has risen, there is no day, no night neither existence nor non-existence; S'iva alone is there."†

Here the words "neither existence nor non-existence" do not preclude even the bare existence of Jîva and bondage—of *pas'u* and *pâs'a* spoken of as *existence* and *non-existence,*— but they only indicate that these are not gross enough to be invested with distinct forms and spoken of by distinct names.

Objection :—Despite the existence of the ever-luminous S'iva, the Supreme Brahman, how can the universe be mere darkness?

Answer :—No. How can it detract from the self-luminous S'iva, the all-witness? There can be no perception of the universe by Jîvas whose body and senses are powerless with regard to sense-objects which, as having then no forms nor names, are beyond perception, while their faculty of spiritual wisdom (Jñâna) is overpowered by original sin (*mala*). Even the self-luminous S'iva does not perceive (the universe) as before. Wherefore this grand state of Supreme Sushupti or Sleep, when there is no cognising whatever of created existence in any particular aspect of its manifestation is spoken of as Tamas. Accordingly the smriti says:

"This was mere Darkness, unknown, without any characteristic marks."*

S'iva is said to have existed *alone*, possessed of the potency of the universe, of sentient and insentient existence in its subtlest form, undistinguishable by name or form. Again, at the time of creation He manifests His Primal S'akti or Energy and then creates from out of Himself and brings into manifestation all sentient and insentient beings,—each with its own form and name—by His own mere thought, without having recourse to an external material cause. Hence the saying of the learned:

"The Deity, the self-conscious A'tman, brings, like a Yogin, the whole existence which lies within, into manifestation without, by means of His will (Ichchhâ), without an upâdâna or material cause."

Objection :—Mâyâ and Purusha are spoken of as the upâdâna or material cause in the following passages of the s'ruti:

"Let him know Mâyâ to be Prakriti and the Possessor of Mâyâ to be the Mahes'vara."†

"From Him Viraj was born."‡

How can it be said that no upâdâna or material cause existed?

Answer :—True. In the production of a jar by a potter, the clod of earth is found to be distinct from the body of the potter and is the material cause of the jar; not so, however, is Mâyâ and the like—which are held to be the upâdâna of the universe—found to exist distinct from the Parames'vara, inasmuch as it is from out of the Parames'vara Himself who puts on the form of Mâyâ that the universe is evolved. Hence no incongruity. Wherefore the Supreme Purusha Himself whose subtle Mâyâ has no independent existence apart from Himself, is said to be also the upâdâna or material cause of the universe. Accordingly the Atharvas'ikhâ says:

"Whatever has to be contemplated, let him contemplate it as the Lord. Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Indra,—all these are born as well as all the sense-organs and the elements of matter. The Cause of causes is not a contemplator. On the other hand, the

* Rik-Samhitâ. 8-3-16.
† S'veta, Up. 4-18.

* Manu-Smriti. 1-5.
† S'vetas'vatara-Up. 4-10.
‡ Purusha-Sukta.

Cause is ever to be contemplated, He who is endued with every kind of power, the Lord of all, the source of all Good abiding in the middle of Light."

Thus, where all beings undergo dissolution, thence only is the origin of all beings, and therefore so long as these beings which are infinite in number are held in dissolution, they abide there alone, in S'iva, of infinite potencies (S'aktis). So it is S'iva, the all-destroyer is the Being denoted by the word 'Brahman.'

As to the contention that, because destruction is an act of cruelty, Brahman becomes tinged with anger, the cause of the cruel act, and other evil qualities, we merely answer that this contention arises from absence of enquiry; the quality of Tamas, which is the root of anger and other evil passions, being an attribute of Prakriti. As to the Parames'vara being above all darkness, the divine s'ruti itself is the authority which says,

> "Umâ being His help-mate, the Supreme Lord,... ....the Witness of all, above Tamas (darkness)."*

The Purânic saying given below also declares that the Parames'vara is ever possessed of Jñâna etc. which prevent delusion and other like sources of evil:

> "Knowledge, indifference to worldly objects, lordly power, austerity, truth, forgiveness, fortitude, creative power, spiritual wisdom, and mastery—these ten ever exist undiminished in S'ankara."

The Purâna says also:

> "He whose pure unfailing intelligence comprehends all objects of knowledge; He is a youth who delight in the joy arising from the tasting of the nectar of His own S'akti."

It is indeed the Parames'vara of infinite glory who, desirous to create, resorts to His own S'akti,—to His Mâyâ, to His Will (Ichchhâ),—with a view to become the manifold universe, as said in the s'ruti, "He desired, may I become many." Then, as the s'ruti says "He brooded over Himself,"* He thinks of the materials, by which to bring into existence bodies suited to the different Jîvas according to their respective Karma, by His power of knowledge (Jñânas'akti) spoken of as *tapas* (penance) in the s'ruti. And having thus brooded, He rouses into being the whole panorama of the universe on the wall of Mâyâ or Ichchhâs'akti by resorting to his Kriyâs'akti which is quite capable of accomplishing all that He has thought of, as declared in the following passage, "He created all this."* Then, as the s'ruti says, "Having created it, He entered into the same,"* He enters the whole creation, and in association with these three S'aktis He becomes the whole universe including the three Mûrtis—the three embodied manifestations of the Lord as caused by the three gunas *satva*, *rajas* and *tamas*)—and other beings. So, who here can gauge the greatness of the omnipotent and omniscient S'iva? Wherefore we may conclude that the all-destroyer is the Parames'vara.

And because of the context (I. ii. 10.)

The passage under discussion occurs in a section devoted to Parames'vara, as the following texts in the same section show:

> "The wise who knows the A'tman as great and omnipresent does never grieve."*

> "That A'tman cannot be gained by the Veda."†

For the foregoing reason also it is evident that the all-destroyer is the Supreme Brahman, the Parames'vara, and none else.

A. Mah'adeva S'a'stri B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Kaivalya-Upanishad.

* Taittiriya-Upanishad 2—6.

† Katha-Upanishad 2—22, 23.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page* 35).)

MAYAVADI'S REFUTATION.

7. How do you make out that the world is *Nirvachana*? Can any fool talk of a thing which is existing and not existing at the same time? If it has an orgin, then it must have an existence. If it does not exist, it will never come into being. When we, however, ordinarily speak of its non-existence, we simply refer to its resolution into its invisible primordial cause.

8. If you say that God and the world bear some resemblance to each other though different like the shell and silver, then we may mistake the world also to be God or an illusion. If you say that Maya was only real when we mistook it for God but became unreal when we saw otherwise, this cannot be. The world in spite of its changes remains unchangeable. Earth cannot become air or fire or *vice versa*. So the world is real both in *Vyavakara* and *Pâramartha*.

9. If you state that the false world arises out of Brahm as the threads which came out of the spider, then it must follow that (the changeless and formless) Intelligence becomes changed and formed into the visible world and corrupted and deluded. If you reply that the spider is not caught in the toils of its own web; but, (then the change would otherwise be impossible), as no cloth can come out of mud.

10. You say that God manifests Himself in different bodies. If God, is so present, then why does He not manifest Himself when the body undergoes various avasthas, such as Swapna, Sushupti, &c., (or in dead bodies). If you explain, that it is so, as *manas* and other karanas are not active, then, it must be, that either God became non-intelligent at times, or with all His presence, the senses became dead.

11. You assert that Brahman is present in these bodies, without any attachment. Yet this Brahman, would not leave the body even when it becomes

---

8. The argument contained in this verse is more pithily expressed in the following couplet.

"இருபொருளுமுண்டேல் எழும்விபரீதம்
ஒருபொருளிற் றோன்றாதென்றோர்."

"If both things exist, then will arise illusion;
Not, when one alone exists."

For an illusion to be called an illusion, there must be a reality underneath the illusion. When all are illusions, the dividing line between an illusion and a reality is destroyed, and the illusion itself becomes a reality. So it is that the Mayavadi is able to perform the remarkable somersault, that while he loses no moment, no opportunity to call everything but his Egoism—we beg pardon—his Ego to be false, he is as much rooted to the things of this earth as anybody else.

9. These two quoted by Gnanapragasar contain the same arguments in simpler language.

"சிலம்பி நூல்போலச் சகம்பரத் திற்றோன்றின்.
மலம் பரத்துண் டேமதி."

"If as web from spider, from God the world appear,
Sin is present in God, it is clear."

இன்றேற் சடமண்ணிறுவாய்ப் பரத்தெழா
இன்றே படமண்ணிலே;

"If not, the achit world will not from God arise
As cloth from mud you can't in any way surprise."

Of course, some belonging to this school, possessed of a 'sharp intellect and bold understanding' do not pause to assert the identity of God and Maya, but we need not be forced into such absurdity if we understand the simile aright. The Mayavadi understands the spider to produce the web which did not exist before or to produce from the same substance as itself. If, however, we distinguish the spider into its life principle, the being with intelligence, volition, judgment &c., and its body, from the shapeless secretions of which the beautiful web is designed, no better simile can be thought out for describing God's creation of the world. The world and creatures stand to God as the body to the soul. From out of His body, from out of the shapeless Maya, He wills that these worlds should arise. The intelligence and design apparent in creation is all his own and can no more be due to Maya, than the beauty and design and judgment displayed in the web can that of the web itself. The material of the web was neither non-existent before nor after. And it cannot be said to be of the same nature as the spider's life-principle. So all this material cause of this world was neither non-existent before nor after and cannot be of the same nature as God's. But as in popular language we always identify the soul and body together, our poets and philosophers always sing of the identity of the worlds and God; though they at the same time take care to assert their difference. Even the insignificant spider has a purpose in making its web; but by denying the existence of the separate souls, Mayavadi's would deny to God that He has any purpose in creating and resolving these worlds. *c.f.* Swetas Upanishad vi 10. "May the One God who, spider-like, enwinds Himself with threads spun from Pradhana, following His nature's law, may He bestow on us regression into Brahm."

10. The Purvapakshi cites as an example the presence of Akas in different pots. To this, the following objections are taken. Why does Brahman leave the dead body? Even when Brahman is present, why do the senses become active and inactive? If the same Being is present in all bodies, why do you hate some people and love others? Why is one of different thinking from another? Why is one an athiest, and another a theist? Why does one undergo misery, when another undergoes pleasure? Is the person suffering in hell, the same as one entering Moksha? Are the King punishing, the felon punished, and their respective capacities the same?

sinful and deceased by old age &c., and shudders at the very thought of such leaving! Though you are fully aware that your Brahman (soul) is attached, it is your vain hope that it be not so.

12. You spoke of the beautiful beads strung on one string, and of these beads being different and yet resting on the same string. You are no doubt correct in comparing the different worlds to the beads and the one unchangeable God to the string. So the worlds change but God remains unchangeable; but that does away with your doctrine of *Abêtha*.

13. Hear O, madman, who say that God is covered by aviddei and maya in union with the body and undergoes pleasures and pains, and yet at the same time assert that He has no attachment, This only appears from your statement that the doctrine of non-attachment cannot be true. If not, why do you undergo pleasure and pains from attachment in actual life. If you say that this is only a *bavana* of the Jîva, then you must have really no shame to say that the Brahman has no attachment and that the Supreme is past thought and speech and that this Supreme Being is yourself.

14. If the A'tma fills each and every body entirely then it cannot undergo the *avestas*, and become inactive. If you say that it is not the A'tma but the *andakaranas* that undergo the *avestas*, then where did your God who was present in the body hide Himself? If God was present, the *Karanas* could not become inactive. If you compare God's action on the andakaranas to that of the magnet on a piece of iron, then the same analogy does not explain how the andakaranas become inactive.

12. The Siddhanti accepts the simile, and no wonder, because the simile occurs in the Gita, a non-mayavada work. "There is naught whatever *higher* than I, O Dhananjaya. All this is woven in me, as multitudes of jewels on a string." (viii. 7).

15. If we can see to-day a sun veiled by darkness, then may a Brahman exist veiled by ignorance mistaking its body and senses for itself. The statement that the soul having its ignorant covering, attains knowledge by clearly perceiving itself to be God, and enters moksha, where the soul becomes itself the only Sat, can only be ridiculous as it involves the proposition that the *amala* (Pure) God can, at the same time, be impure, to necessitate its removal.

16. Purity cannot become an accident of the Supreme Param It is an eternal attribute of Him. You ascribe impurity to the chit (soul) derived from Brahman, and in consequence, you impute impurity to its cause, Brahman also. You do not understand the nature of the soul and *mala* and *karma* and *maya* and their First Cause, the Supreme God. If you instance the analogy of fire latent before and now manifest in wood, this only applies to the case of body and soul, and implies duality.

17. When you speak of the self enjoying in the self, duality is clearly involved. If you say that you do not perceive yourself on the enjoyer, then the person enjoying himself is gone. If you say that Moksha is merely removal of ignorance, even then there will be sentience present. If you deny this sentience and say that conscious sentience is only Maya, then your Brahman itself can only be all Maya and be therefore destructible.

18. Understand well the meaning of the Vedic Text '*Tatvamasi*' (Thou art that). Knowing well the distinction between yourself and the Supreme Cause, practice *Soham bavana*. To approach the Feet of the Lord difficult to be thought of by the Gods, practice the beautiful Sadanas and attain Yoga and Gnana.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.,

(To be continued).

ODE TO SAKTI,

UNIVERSAL MOTHER.

When the Absolute becomes manifest, it is as Force, *Sakti*, of which the universe is the product, being from cycle to cycle evolved by Force from cosmic substance (âkâsa) and again involved. "'All the choir of heaven and the furniture of the earth' are the transitory forms of parcels of cosmic substance, wending along the road of evolution from nebulous potentiality, through endless growths of sun and satellite, through all varieties of matter, through infinite diversities of life and thought, possibly through modes of being of which we neither have any conception nor are competent to form any, back to the indefinite latency from which they arose." *

Not brute and blind but full of intelligence and grace is the Power which thus makes and unmakes, and which by the Sages of India is accordingly regarded as the Universal Mother, and being inseparably inherent in God, is also called the Consort of God.

" Mother of millions of world-clusters, yet Virgin
by the Vedas called."

மலர் விரையுங் கதிரொளியு முயிருடலு மணியின்
வளர்தேசு முரு நிழலு மலிபொருளோடுரையும்
நிலவுதல் போனிட் களத்தைப் பிரியாது மருவி
நிகழ் சகளத்துப் பதிக்கு நிறைமனையாய மன்னி
உலகுயிர் மைந்தர்கள் பிறவிப் பசிகெட வெந்நாளு
மோவாதாநந்த வமுதூட்டி யவ்வீட்டிருத்தும்
திலகநுதற் சிவகாம சுந்தரியார் பாதச்
செங்கமலந் தலைமீதிற்றிகழுற வைத்திடுவாம்.

" My head I crown with lotus feet of Sivakâma
Sundari
Who with the Absolute inseparably is blended
As flower and scent, as sun and ray, as life and
body,
As gem and lustre, form and shadow, word and
meaning,
Who to the manifested Lord as Consort shines,
Who ever cures the life-hunger † of her children,
all living things,
With ceaseless bliss ambrosial feeding
And in Freedom's mansion establishing." ‡

* Huxley 'Evolution and Ethics.'

† Liability of the soul to reincarnation, until it becomes pure and fit for union with God.

‡ Chidambaraswami, 'Panchadhikâravilakkam.' (பஞ்சதிகார விளக்கம்).

15

What do we see or know save this Power? The opening rose bud, its form, scent, colour, the lark "at break of day from sullen earth arising and singing hymns at Heaven's gate," the leaf rotting on the highway, Bill Sykes on his burglarious errand, the hardness of the coal-scuttle that makes his shins tingle, the loving soul that toils among the lepers and seeks a leper's grave, the seer proclaiming the truth "till the world is wrought to sympathy with hopes and fears it heeded not,"—all, all is Force, the Divine Emanation.

The various manifestions of Force are grouped by the Saiva Siddhanta school under five heads which are deemed the principal aspects of the Great Mother. Evolution (srishti), maintenance (sthiti), involution (samhâra), obscuration (tirobhâva), grace (anugraha). The evolving Sakti (Brahma) evolves for each soul according to its deserts a body (tanu), organs of knowledge (karana), pains and pleasures (bhoga), and spheres (bhuvana) to experience them in. The maintaining or preserving Sakti (Vishnu) maintains them for a time and enables the soul to experience them. The involving or destroying Sakti (Rudra) withdraws them and makes them disappear. The obscuring Sakti (Mahes'a) entangles the soul in them so that, unable to distinguish the real from the unreal, it identifies itself with its fictitious envelopments, calling the body and organs of knowledge 'I' and the pains and pleasures and spheres 'mine.' The Gracious Sakti (Sadâs'ivam) enlightens the soul, delivers it from its delusion and bondage, and establishes it in union with God, the ultimate goal.

The earliest manifestations of Sakti are Vibration (Nâda) and the Word. Among the later manifestations the most venerated in India is gentle, benign Umâ,beloved of Siva (Siva-Kâmi), "mother that yields all the heart desireth". According to an ancient tradition she appeared in response to the prayers of a Himalayan king as an infant floating in a golden-lily lake and was thence taken and reared by the king until given in marriage to the Lord Siva who came to claim her.

Hence the refrain of the Ode,

" Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast
born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his
eye."

In this character of the Highland Maid, under the name of Malaivalar Kâtali (மலைவளர்காதலி) she is worshipped at Tevai* (near Ramnad in the Madras Presidency) where the Saint Tâyumânavar sang this beautiful hymn which recalls the choral odes of Sophokles and, I think, excels them. The translation which I have added does scant justice to it.

மலைவளர்காதலி.

பதியுண்டு நிதியுண்டு புத்திரர்கண் மித்திரர்கள்
பக்கமுண் டெக்காலமும்
பவிசுண்டு தவிசுண்டு திட்டாந்த மாகயம
படரெனுந் திமிரமணுகாக்
கதியுண்டு ஞானமாங் கதிருண்டு சதிருண்டு
காயசித் திகளுமுண்டு
கறையுண்ட கண்டர்பா லம்மைநின் னருளிற்
கருத்தொன்று முண்டாகுமேல்
நதியுண்ட கடலெனச் சமயத்தை யுண்டபர
ஞானவா னந்தவொளியே
நாதாந்த ரூபமே வேதாந்த மோனமே
நானெனு மகந்தை தீர்த்தென்
மதியுண்ட மதியான மதிவதன வல்லியே
மதுசூ தனன்றங்கையே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

Mansion and wealth, children and friends around,
Splendour ever and throne, the certainty
That Death's dark messengers draw not nigh,
Wisdom's light, purity, wondrous powers,—
All these are mine, so with Thy feet
My thought be one, O Mother that hast
Thy seat beside the dark-throated Lord† !
Light and Bliss of Knowledge Supreme, that
Swallowest religions as ocean rivers !
O Stillness, the Vedas' goal,
Thy form seen where vibration ends !
O Wisdom, me of 'I' and thought ridding !
Lady, beauteous as the moon, Madusudana's ‡ sister,
Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye !

தெட்டிலே வலியமட மாதர்வாய் வெட்டிலே
சிற்றிடையி லேநடையிலே
சேலொத்த விழியிலே பாலொத்த மொழியிலே
சிறுபிறை நுதற்கீற்றிலே
பொட்டிலே யவர்கட்டு பட்டிலே புனைகந்த
பொடியிலே யடியிலேமேல்
பூரித்த முலையிலே நிற்கின்ற நிலையிலே
புந்திதனை நுழையவிட்டு
நெட்டிலே யலையாம லறிவிலே பொறையிலே
நின்னடியர் கூட்டத்திலே
நிலைபெற்ற வன்பிலே மலைவற்ற மெய்ஞ்ஞான
ரூபத்தி லேயுனிருதாள்
மட்டிலே மனதுசெல நினதருளு மருள்வையோ
வளமருவு தேவையரசே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

Maidens' wiles, repartees, slender waist,
Witching* eyes, gait, honeyed † speech,
Eyebrows like the crescent moon,
Beauty-spots, silk robes and scents, shapely feet,
Full breasts erect, ravishing pose,—
In these my curious mind not to enter
And wander dazed, but in wisdom's search
And self-restraint and Thy servants' company,
Enduring love and knowledge pure and truth,
Thy feet alone to seek, wilt Thou gracious
Grant to me, Queen of fertile Tevai ?
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye !

பூதமுத லாகவே நாதபரி யந்தமும்
பொய்யென் றெனைக்காட்டியென்
போதத்தி னடுவாகி யடியீறு மில்லாத
போதபூ ரணவெளிக்குள்
ஏதுமற நில்லென் றுபாயமா வைததுநினை
வெல்லாஞ்செய் வல்லசித்தாம்
இன்பவுரு வைத்தநத வன்னையே நின்னையே
யெளியேன் மறந்துய்வனோ
வேதமுத லானநல் லாகமத் தன்மையை
விளக்குமுட் கண்ணிலார்க்கும்
மிக்கநின் மகிமையைச் சேளாத செவிடர்க்கும்
வீறுவா தம்புகலும்வாய்
வாதநோ யாளர்க்கு மெட்டாத முக்கணுடை
மாமருந் துக்கமிர்தமே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

From the elements to Vibration Thou showedst
To me as false: myself to me unveiledst.
In the core of my intelligence standing,
"Stand still, free‡ in Spirit-space all-filling,

*" The city of the Lady " from Tevi (Sansk. Devi).

† Siva, also called Nîlakanta (dark throated), from his throat having been stained with a dread poison which he is said to have swallowed in order to save the celestials from imminent destruction by it.

‡ Vishnu.

* Literally 'like the sel-fish.'

† Lit. " milk-like.'

‡ i. e. free from thought and sleep: a state of 'pure consciousness.' See note to v. 24 of 'A Revel in Bliss.'

Without beginning, without end," Thou saidst,
And skilfully establish'dst me, O Mother,
Who vouchsafest pure knowledge and bliss,
Yielding all the heart desireth.
Forgetting Thee can I, poor wretch, live?
Darling of the three-eyed Lord*, of all ills
The panacea, beyond the reach of them
That lack the inner eye which illumineth
The Vedas and excellent Agamas,
Beyond the deaf who hear not the praise of Thy
 might,
Beyond the stricken with the plague of contro-
 versy!
Lady Uma who lovest mountain-haunts and wast
 born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his
 eye!

மிடியிட்ட வாழ்க்கையா லுப்பிட்ட கலமெனவு
 மெய்யெலா முள்ளு டைந்து
வீறிட்ட செல்வர்தந் தலைவாயில் வாசமாய்
 வேதனைக ளுற வேதனும்
துடியிட்ட வெவ்வினையை யேவினான் பாவிநான்
 தொடரிட்ட தொழில்களெல்லாம்
துண்டிட்ட சாண்கும்பி யின்பொருட்டாயதுன்
 றொண்டர்பணி செய்வ தென்றோ
அடியிட்ட செந்தமிழி னருமையிட் டாரூரி
 லரிவையோர் பரவை வாயில்
அம்மட்டு மடியிட்டு நடைநடந் தருளடிக
 ளடியீது முடியீ தென
வடியிட்ட மறைபேசு பச்சிளங் கிள்ளையே
 வளமருவு தேவை யரசே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
 வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

Body all broken inwardly with life of affliction,
My days in pain to spend at the gates of the
 proud rich,—
Brahma thus my cruel fate hath ordered.†
All I do and toil, poor wretch,
Is for a ragged span belly's sake.
When, oh when, Thy servants shall I serve?
Green,‡ gentle parrot whom the Vedas pure
Declare to be the base and crown
Of the Lord who at A'rúr gracious paced*
The peerless woman Paravai's door,
To pity melted by His servant's strains
Of rare, pure Tamil! Queen of fertile Tevai,
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast
 born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of hi
 eye!

பூரணி புராதநி சுமங்கலை சுதந்தரி
 புராந்தகி த்ரியம்பகி யெழிற்
புங்கவி விளங்குசிவ சங்கரி சகஸ்ரதள
 புட்பமிசை வீற்றிருக்கும்
நாரணி மனாதீத நாயகி குணாதீத
 நாதாந்த சத்தி யென்றுன்
நாமமே யுச்சரித் திடுமடியர் நாமமே
 நானுச் சரிக்க வசமோ
ஆரணி சடைக்கடவு ளாரணி யெனப்புகழ
 வகிலாண்ட கோடி யீன்ற
அன்னையே பின்னையுங் கன்னியென மறைபேசு
 மானந்த ரூப மயிலே
வாரணியு மிருகொங்கை மாதர்மகிழ் கங்கைபுகழ்
 வளமருவு தேவை யரசே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
 வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

" All-filling, Ancient, Auspicious, Independent,
Destroyer of the Triple city,† Three-eyed,
Beauteous, Excellent, Blissful, Causing bliss,
Nârani on thousand-petalled lotus ‡ throned,
Sovereign Lady beyond the ken of thought,
Cosmic Force transcending quality,
Manifest there where Vibration ceaseth":—
Of Thy servants who thus chant Thy names
Am I worthy even to utter their names?
As Mistress of the Vedas hailed by Him §
Whose locks are wreathed with a'tti flower,—
Mother of millions of world-clusters,
Yet Virgin by the Vedas called!
O Swan ‖ whose form is bliss! Fertile Tevai's
 Queen,

* Siva. The third eye is the eye of wisdom, located between the eyebrows and closed except in the Jnâni. Its site is indicated by the spot of sandal or other paste which Hindus usually wear on their forehead to remind them of the latent power of vision which it should be their endeavour to awaken and master.

† Hardly to be taken literally, for the poet was an honoured prime minister blessed with nearly all the good things mentioned in the 1st stanza. The allusion is to the troubles and distractions of political and court life, usually fatal to spiritual growth.

‡ Exoterically the Sakti is represented as of dark green colour.

* Siva is said in the 'Periapurâna' to have acted as an intermediary to effect a reconciliation between his devotee Sundaramurti and his wife Paravai. For the Lord is "the servant of His servants." Much more then should others serve His servants.

† Three strongholds of Asuras (Titans), enemies of the celestials.

‡ Siva.

§ Literally 'pea-hen.'

‖ According to the *Raja Yogi* there runs through the spinal cord a canal called the *Sushumna*, at the base of which is a plexus called the *Mûlâdhâra* (basic) and at the crown in the brain the plexus called the *Sahasrâsra* (thousand-petalled lotus). In the *basic* plexus is stored the cosmic energy an infinitesimal fraction of which is distributed throughout the body by the sensory and motor nerves, and mainly by the two columns of nerves called *Ida* and *Pingala* on either side of the *Sushumna* canal. This canal, though existing in all animals, is closed except in the Yogi. He dispenses with sensory and motor nerves, opens the canal, sends through it all mental currents, makes the body a gigantic battery of will, and rouses the vast coiled up power (usually called the *Kundalini*) from the basic plexus to the 'thousand petalled lotus' in the brain. As the power travels up the canal, higher and more wonderful powers of vision and knowledge are gained till the goal is reached of union with God.

Praised of Ganga in whose waters maidens sport!
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

பாகமோ பெறவுனைப் பாடவறி யேன்மல
பரிபாகம் வரவு மனதிற்
பண்புமோ சற்றுமிலை நியமமோ செய்திடப்
பாவியேன் பாப ரூப
தேகமோ திடமில்லை ஞானமோ கனவிலுஞ்
சிந்தியேன் பேரின்பமோ
சேரவென் றுற்கள்ள மனதுமோ மெத்தவுஞ்
சிந்திக்கு தென்செய்குவேன்
மோகமோ மதமோ குரோதமோ லோபமோ
முற்றுமாற சரிய மோதான்
முறியிட் டெனைக்கொள்ளு நிதிய மோதேட வெனின்
மூசுவரி வண்டுபோல
மாகமோ டவும்வல்ல னெனையாள வல்லையோ
வளமருவு தேவை யரசே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

To qualify for Thee I cannot sing Thy praise.
To be ripe for Thy Grace, taint all washed away,
My mind hath not one jot of goodness.
To make it pure this wretch sinful body
Has not the strength. I think not of wisdom
Even in dream. To seek the Infinite Bliss
My roguish mind ponders much and vacillates.
Alas! What shall I do? Lust, pride, avarice,
Hatred, envy,—of these I am the bond-slave.
In search of wealth the whole world I dare traverse
Like bee ever on the wing. Will Thou not me
Thy vassal enrol, Queen of fertile Tevai?
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

தூளேறு தூசுபோல் வினையேறு மெய்யெனுந்
தொக்கினுட் சிக்கிநாளும்
சுழலேறு காற்றினிடை யழலேறு பஞ்செனச்
சூறையிட் டறிவையெல்லாம்
நாளேற நாளேற வார்த்திக மெனுங்கூற்றி
னட்பேற வுள்ளு டைந்து
நயனங்களற்றதோ ரேறு போலவே
நானிலந் தனிலலையவோ
வேளேறு தந்தியைக் கனதந்தி யுடன்வென்று
விரையேறு மாலைசூடி
விண்ணேறு மேகங்கள் வெற்பேறி மறைவுற
வெருட்டிய கருங்கூந்தலாய்
வாளேறு கண்ணியே விடையேறு மெம்பிரான்
மனதுக் கிசைந்த மயிலே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

With the accumulating dust of deeds
In this body choking,—intelligence
Daily ravaged like bale of cotton
Whereon wind-fed fire hath seized,—
Death-demon, old age, more and more
Affectionate daily growing,—shall I
Wander this earth a blind ownerless bull?
Lady, whose dark locks wreathed with fragrant flower
Excel the blackness of night, Cupid's charger,
And drive rain-clouds to hide in shame
Over the mountain-tops! Bright eyed Uma,—
Near to the heart of Our Lord* that rideth the Ox,—
Who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

பூதமொடு பழகிவள ரிந்திரிய மாம்பேய்கள்
புந்திமுத லானபேய்கள்
போராடு கோபாதி ராக்ஷசப் பேய்களென்
போதத்தை யூடழித்து
வேதனை வளர்த்திடச் சதுர்வேத வஞ்சன்
விதித்தானி வல்லலெல்லாம்
வீழும் படிக்குனது மௌனமந் த்ராதிக்ய
வித்தையை வியந்தருள்வையோ
நாதவடி வாக்கிய மஹாமந்த்ர ரூபியே
நாதாந்த வெட்டவெளியே
நற்சமய மாம்பயிர் தழையவரு மேகமே
ஞானவா னந்தமயிலே
வாதமிடு பரசமயம் யாவுக்கு முணர்வரிய
மகிமைபெறு பெரியபொருளே
வரைராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லிப்பெண்ணுமையே.

The devils, organs of sense and action,
Comrades of the five elements,†
The devils, mind-organs,
The furious warring demons, anger and the rest,
Have bred woe, my intelligence destroying
Thus hath Brahma willed.
To end all this woe, wilt Thou vouchsafe
The knowledge of Thy Word of Silence,
Thou whose form is Vibration and the great Word?
O Pure space there where Vibration ceaseth!
O Rain-cloud that maketh true religion thrive!
Mighty Substance beyond the ken of all
Brawling religions! Swan ‡ of wisdom and bliss!
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

P. A.

* Siva who rideth the Ox (pasu, also=the soul) and is called Pasupati, Lord of Souls.

† The organs of sense and action (Jnanendriya and Karmendriya) —not the visible organs but the brain-centres—spring, according to Hindu psychologists, from, and are maintained by, the subtle elements (Sukshma bhuta): hence called their comrades.

‡ Lit. 'Pea-hen.'

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, AUGUST 1898.

THE TWO GEMS.

(SAT AND SATASAT).

" எவ்வெவர் தன்மையும் தன்வயிற்படுத்தும்
தானேயாகிய தயாபரன் எம்மிறை."

"To each and every one, His own nature imparting
Our Lord stands alone, Supreme, full of Grace."

Thiruvachakam.

We proceed to explain the two verses we quoted from Thirumular at the close of our last article. The two verses seem so like that unless they are looked into more closely, their meaning is likely to be lost. These verses explain in fact the *Bhanda* and *Moksha* conditions of the soul, and the soul's ascent through various stages, called *Tatwa Darsanam*, *Atma Darsanam* and *Siva* or *Para Darsanam*. The verse, "The gold was concealed in the golden ornament &c." has to be taken first. The object before the seer is a golden ornament. The thing can be looked at from two different points of view, in two different aspects. It can be viewed as merely gold, and then we are solely engaged in looking at its colour, its fineness, specific gravity &c., and while we are so engaged, the other view of it, whether it is a brooch, or medal or a bracelet &c. is altogether lost to view. And in the same manner when we are viewing the object as a mere ornament then all idea of the gold, its fineness &c. is lost. This happens when the object before us is one and the same, and neither the gold as gold, nor the ornament as ornament can be said to non-exist, in either case, can be said to be unreal or a mere delusion. We merely change our point of view, and we are ourselves under no delusion at either moment. The delusion is neither in the gold nor in the ornament nor in ourselves. The object before us is so made that it possesses this double nature or aspect so to say, and our own Psychological structure is such that we can change from one to the other point. And each point of view has its own vantage ground. A person going to a jeweller's shop cannot afford to lose sight of either point, and if he does, he is sure to make a bad bargain. What would we think of this man if he goes into the shop with the firm idea that of the jewel he is going to buy, the gold is a mere name, and delusion, or the ornament is a mere name and delusion. When bargaining, however, after he had once tested the fineness of the gold, and colour, he need trouble himself no more about it, and he can proceed to examine the shape of the ornament, its size &c.

Taking this analogy, Thirumular proceeds to point out the same relation between the individual ego, the subject, and its objective senses. The word used is 'தன்,' standing as it does for the individual ego, jiva, soul, pasu, or chit. The phrase 'தன் கரணங்களாம்,' also brings out the meaning of 'தன்,' and it cannot refer to the Supreme Brahman, as was interpreted by a Hindu Idealist. Of course he could not help saying so, as the being which he postulates above 'its senses' (தன் கரணங்கள்) is God, the Supreme. Saint Thirumular was prophetic enough to see such a misinterpretation of his words, and it is therefore why he sung the next verse, "மரத்தை மறைத்தது," 'the tree was concealed &c.,' In our article on 'Mind and Body' we have fully discussed the relation which Saint Thirumular perceives between the Individual Ego, the soul and its body and senses. When the individual *pasu* lives a purely objective existence, by caring for his body, his comforts, his weath, his pleasures, &c., his true self, the mind, is altogether identified with the world; and he himself lies buried, concealed. Look at the words, our Saint has selected. He does not cry false, false, delusion, delusion at every turn. He actually uses 'மறைத்தது,' 'மறைந்தது,' "concealed" and "is concealed"? Neither the soul nor the world is a myth, a delusion; but only when the mind was in an objective condition, it was concealed by the object. When the soul regains its own self, by forgetting the world, the world has not become a myth, only it lies concealed, merged in the soul itself. The thoughtless critic is apt to consider such distinctions, as mere wordy warfare, but no student of philosophy can easily afford to ignore the first principles of correct reasoning, by choosing his words, each one to express one particular idea and no other; and many a specious and delusive argument has had its genesis in such ignorant and ambiguous use of words. To proceed, when the soul lies so concealed in the world, this constitutes its *bhanda*, bound condition, and the thing so concealing is called

bhanda or *Pasa*. When the soul learns to discriminate between its own nature and the nature of the world, and to rate the lower as its own worth, then its attains to *Tatwa Darsanam and Atma Darsanam*. And the whole field of Ethics is evolved from our perception of these relations aright. When man perceives that the more he is attached to the world, the more his own faculties get clouded and he is led more into sorrow and suffering. and the more he frees himself from such attachment, the more he frees himself from sin and sorrow and developes in himself his higher spiritual nature, then it is that his moral faculties are developed and in course of time strengthened by constant practice. But then there is this peculiarity about the mind of man, which is nowhere noticed in any other system that we know of and which we have already referred to in our last article, its intermediate nature between *Sat* and *Asat*, and which therefore gives it its name of *Satasat* and which peculiarity *Kannudaya Vallalar* (author of Ozhivilodukkum) emphasises by using the expressive name of அலி, or Hermaphrodite, neither male nor female, neither Sat nor Asat. But the rule in Tamil grammar for determining the sex of the hermaphrodite is "ஆணுறுப்புமிகுந்தால் ஆணாகும் பெண்ணுறுப்புமிகுந்தால் பெண்ணாகும்." 'The sex follows the more predominating organs present,' and so a hermaphrodite person will always be called either he or she and not it. The life of the individual soul is as such passed either as Asat or as Sat, and it has no life of its own. That is, it cannot exist by itself, independent of its relation with either Padartha. If either God or the world did not exist, the existence of the soul would be an impossibility. Saint Meikandan uses two analogies to illustrate the position. The soul is compared to an object suspended in air, and a flood of water. We cannot imagine an object suspended in air without a support. If the support is removed, the object falls to the ground. Saint Meikandan had as such distinctly before him the question "why does an apple fall to the ground." The actual example he had before him was a swing attached by a rope to a tree. The tree holds up the object by its own force. When this force is weakened and loosened, another force is brought into place, the force of the earth, gravity. The object was in fact held in between these two forces. The object must either be attached to the tree or to the earth. In spite of the enormous power of gravitation exerted by the earth, the tree was able to hold up the object for a time. Only for a time, for when the fruit matures, the tree cannot hold it up, however it may will to do so. The same act accomplishes the severence from the tree and the bringing it to the earth. Just so, in the case of the soul. It is bound to Maya and Mala, so long the soul is not ripe. Before it is ripe, we do not perceive its brightness and sweetness. When the soul perfects itself, fed by the juices from the earth (the Grace of God) it finds its resting place in God. When it so finds itself, united, it becomes one with God, as the fruit itself when left alone becomes one with the earth. The flood again cannot stand still unless it is held up by an embankment. When this embankment is breached, it will run on and on till it finds its resting place in the broad arms of the ocean. Without either of these means of support it will be difficult to restrain the fleeting soul. The embankment or the flood gates are the Maya support of the soul. The ocean is God. This support is called in Tamil பற்று, a support, a bond of attachment, a rest, desire, love. It is this peculiarity which Saint Thiruvalluvar expresses in the following couplet,

> பற்றுக பற்றற்றான் பற்றினை, யப்பற்று
> பற்றுக, பற்றுவிடற்கு.

which again is the mere echo of our Saint Manickavachaka's words.

> "சுற்றிய சுற்றித் தொடர் வறுப்பான்றொல் புகழே
> பற்றி யிப் பாசத்தைப் பற்றற நாம்பற்றுவான்
> பற்றிய பேரானந்தம் பாடுதும் காணம்மானாய்."

This peculiarity of the soul we have been discussing above has a tremendous bearing in connection with various philosophical schools. The ancient Buddha and the modern Agnostic would not postulate this other support and resting place of the soul. And we find they are landed in Nihilism accordingly. The moment of perfection is the moment of annihilation to the Buddhist. Nay, with his modern Apostles, Mrs. Annie Besant for example, the cry of the Vedas, 'whence there is no return, there is no return" is merely a vain cry. There is no such thing as final perfection, beatitude or Moksha. The soul must roll on ever and anon, subject to the never-ceasing and ever-recurring evolution due to "the moral necessity connected with the central and most precious doctrine of the exoteric Vedanta, the doctrine of Samsara." Here of course we see the phenomenon of extremes meeting. The Vedantist could not deny the possibility of the soul attaining the so-called moksha, re-

curring back into the cycle of evolution, as the original retrogression of Brahman into Gods and men, brutes and worms is itself not explicable by him. The Agnostic not believing in God, examines into the nature of the mind or soul and perceiving how intimately it is connected with matter, denies of course, its separate personality and independent existence; and hence his denial of the soul's immortality and future existence, when once its mortal coil is broken. In the case of the Vedantist, however, this peculiarity of the soul will alone furnish the excuse for his theory. And we have heard honest Vedantists admit this as the only explanation of Sri Sankara's otherwise untenable position. When in union with God, the soul has lost not merely the consciousness of the world, the Asat, it loses also its self-consciousness, (not be it remarked its self-being) it loses also its consciousness of difference from God &c. and the only perception that remains is the bare perception—the bare enjoyment of God,—the full manifestation and Presence of God as Love and Bliss alone is felt; and in such a condition, Sankara could say there is no second thing.

" சென்று சென்றணுவாய்த் தேய்ந்து
தேய்ந்தொன்றும் "

Sankara's experience will therefore be only one-sided one, and the statement cannot stand as a matter of proof. The state in union with God is called Thuriya or Para-Avasta, and in this condition, though the conscious perception of the world and soul may not be possible, their be-ness (existence) is not gone. And it is this condition, Saint Thirumular expounds in his next verse.

மரத்தை மறைத்தது மாமதயானை,
மரத்தின் மறைந்தது மாமதயானை,
பரத்தை மறைத்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்,
பரத்தை மறைந்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்.

The tree was concealed in the mad elephant;
The tree concealed the mad elephant.
The world concealed the Supreme,
The Supreme concealed the world.

The Supreme is concealed in the world (not non-existent), the world is concealed in the Supreme (not non-existent). In the sentences, 'I was concealed by the world, the world was concealed in me, note the fact that there are only two names, two categories involved, namely I and the world, soul and maya. For an intelligent understanding of the proposition no other category is required. But consider well the propositions, 'the world concealed the Supreme, the world is concealed by the Supreme. These propositions could not be true as they stand, unless both these stand as objective to the seer, as in the illustration of the wooden-toy itself. The wood of the toy cannot be conscious of its being concealed or not by the elephant form, nor the elephant of the wood. In human language and expression and argument there is always an ellipsis and the suppression of the middle term. The first two propositions relating to the wooden-toy cannot be true as they stand but is only intelligible, when we supply the factor of the seer. So also, the propositions that follow though they only contain the two categories Sat and Asat, involve the presence of a third, the Satasat. What we have stated above will explain the Sivagnanabotha Sutra,

" யாவையுஞ் சூனியம் சத்தெதிராதலின்
சத்தேயறியாது, அசத்திலது அறியாது,
இருதிறனறிவுள திரண்டலா ஆன்மா."

That we are concealed by our Maya covering is a fact, the sharpest intellect and the boldest understanding cannot get over it, quibble and juggle as it may, and this being a fact, "that we are here in ignorance, sin, misery, and that we know the way out of them, but the question of a cause for them is senseless."* For nothing can be more senseless to ask for an explanation, when the fact to be explained is itself an ultimate fact. An ounce of fact outweighs a pound of probabilities, say the lawyers. And they only express a logical truth. But the proposition advanced by the Purvapakshi is that the jiva, being neither a part nor a different thing, nor a variation of Brahman and must be the Paramatman fully and totally himself, and as such is, clothed with such attributes as all-pervadingness, eternity, almightiness, exemption of time, space and causality, and that this jiva is hidden by the world † (maya and avidya) as the fire in wood, (or as Saint Thirumular would put it, wood in the elephant) and he asks what is the cause of this concealment? Why should the perfect become deluded into the imperfect by avidya and ignorance? Dr. Paul Deussen admits that here all philosophers of India (of his ilk—Sankara included) and Greece and everywhere have been defective, until Kant came to show us that the whole question is inadmissible. We say 'ditto' also, whatever might be the learned Doctor's understanding of Kant. The whole

* Paul Deussen's *Elements of Metaphysics*. p. 334.
† *Ibid*. p. 334.

question is inadmissible, nay the whole proposition of the Purvapakshi on which this question is based is inadmissible, it is untrue, is not a fact. The fact is not true that the Supreme Brahman is concealed by Maya and Avidya. Dr. Deussen would put his unfortunate Brahman into the dock and arraign him of high crimes and misdecneanours (our friends are never conscious of what gross blasphemy they are guilty of—our mind is extremely pained that we should even write so, for argument's sake) and before proving his guilt, with which he charges him, he would indulge in irrelevant and irreverent talk, as to why and wherefore this Brahman committed these crimes. Any ordinary judge would rule his talk as senseless; also, such talk from the accused's counsel, kindly engaged by the crown, would be ruled as senseless, when the accused admits the charge, and there is besides overwhelming testimony as to his guilt, leaving no room for doubt. The case contemplated by the learned Doctor will find a parallel in some of those occasional cases of judicial murder. A great crime had been committed, there is a great hue and cry, some body ought to be punished, ought to suffer for the unknown criminal. The Police run down some one they have long known, an old offender, witnesses (Pseudo-gnanis, with their Swanubhuti and esoteric experience) only flock in overwhelming numbers to prove the prisoner's guilt the weight of testimony is only crushing, the poor prisoner at the bar is simply dumb-foundered and cannot find speech to exculpate himself, however innocent he might be, and his silence counts for confession and he is condemned to die. Before his bones are whitened however, the real criminal turns up, confesses his crime, and the first conviction is found after all to be based on a case of mistaken identity. We have already shown how liable is the soul to be mistaken for God, to mistake itself for God. Saint Meikandan even where he teaches the initiate to practice Soham-bavana, cautions him before and after not to mistake himself for God.

'யாவையும் சூனியம் சத்தெதிர்.' 'In the Presence of the Sat, all else is Sunyam.' Why, because, 'before the Perfect and Eternal Intelligence, (Truth) the imperfect and acquired intelligence, (the semblance) is shorn of its light,' answers our Saint, and he illustrates it by saying that the Evil Asat ceases to exist before Him, as does darkness before the sun and explains that Hara cannot know them as objects, as nothing is outside Him. How well this explanation fits in with the vedic text, "There shines not the sun, nor moon, nor stars, neither these lightnings, much less this earthly fire. After Him, the Shining One, all things shine, by His Light is lighted this whole world."* And when before this shining One, even the suns and moons pale, they dare assert that darkness, maya, and avidya can dare lift up their heads and veil and conceal and dim His brightness, and that on account of this veiling, the shining One can become deluded and fancy Himself as Asat, this body and these senses, and this world. Well does the Siddhanti ask, can you show me a sun covered by darkness, for me to believe in a Brahman veiled by Maya or Upadhi.† No doubt the blind man says, the sun is hid by darkness; he would not confess his own blindness and darkness and transfers his infirmity to the Effulgent Sun. "After Him, all things shine, by His light is lighted the whole world." Yes, O Lord, we are but broken lights of Thee. The little light that shines in each one of our souls is simply borrowed from Thee. Without this light, we are but the pieces of diamonds lying in darkness. In bandha, before the diamond is cut and polished, we cannot reflect Thy Glorious Light. We are the diamond crystals, Thou, the light shining in them: வெண்பளிங்கின் உட்பதித்த சோதியானே ! As crystal, we become light in light, and dark in darkness. யாதொன்று பற்றினதன் இயல்பாய நின்ற பந்தமறும் பளிங்கனை யம்யாம். Thou art like the Light from the emerald, மரகதம், lighting and colouring everything it touches after itself.

எவ்வெவர் தன்மையும் தன்வயிற் படுத்தும்
தானேயாகிய தயாபரா !

The Diamond crystal (சார்ந்ததன் வண்ணமாகும்) *and the gem Emerland* (சார்ந்தத தன் வண்ணமாக்கும்) *these are the symbols used by the Siddhantis for the Soul and Sivam.* Students of Science know the structural difference between those two bodies, as mediums or distributors of light. This Divine Light is Uma, (literally wisdom or light) that Lady wondrous fair who showed to the astonished immortals, Her Royal Consort, and her colour is green emerald, and we will

---

* Swetas. vi. 14.

† *c.f.* "இருள்பொதிந்த பானுவுளதேல் உடலியானென்,
மருள்பொதிந்த சித்துளதிம்மன்."

If there is a Sun by darkness veiled
Then may a chit exist by ignorance veiled.

"நின்மலமென்றேயதனை நீகழ்த்திறையதற்குப்
பின்னவித்தை யுண்டென்கைபித்து."

Having called Him Ninmala
It is madness to impute to God Avidya.

close this article by invoking her aid and quoting this passage from Kumaragurupara which is poetic and philosophic at the same time.

பண்ணுறு கிளிமொழிப் பாவைநின் திருமேனி பாசொளி
விரிப்ப வந்தண்,
பவளக் கொடிக் காமர் பச்சிளங் கொடியதாய், பருமு
த்தம் மரகதமாய்,
தண்ணுறு மல்லற்றுறைச் சிறை யனங்களி தழைக்குங்
கலா மஞ்ஞையாய்
சகலமும் நின் திருச் சொரூபமென் றோதிடும் சதுர்
மறைப் பொருள் வெளியாகும்.

O Thou parrot-tongued Maid, The emerald Light
from Thy sacred body spreading,
Converts the red coral reefs into green and the
big pearls into so many emeralds,
And the winged swans floating on the cool waves
into so many sporting peacocks
And thus explain the truth which the Vedas
proclaim,
'That after you, all things shine.'

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

THE DIVINE PERFECTIONS.

(*Continued from page 40.*)

The young man approaching, said: "What romance, ladies, are you reading with so much attention"?

"We are not, sir, reading any romance" they replied.

"Not a romance! What book, then, pray?

"We are reading the History of the people of God."

"The History of the people of God! Do you then, also believe that there is a God?"

Astonished at such a question the young girls looked at each other, their faces covered with blushes "And you sir" said the elder. "do you not believe it?"

"I believed it once" replied the young man, "but since going to reside in Paris, where I have studied philosophy, mathematics, medicine, and politics, I have been convinced that God is only a word." "As for me, sir" answered the little girl, "I have never been in Paris; I have never studied philosophy, or mathematics, or those other fine things which you know: I know a little more than my catechism. But since you are so learned, and say there is no God, will you tell me, what does an egg come from."

The child pronounced these words in so clear a tone of voice as to be heard by a portion of the company. A few persons drew nigh to know what was the matter; others followed; and, finally, the whole company assembled round the window to hear the dialogue. "Yes, sir," continued the child, "since you say there is no God, be so good as to tell me what does an egg come from"?

"An amusing question! An egg comes from a hen."

"And what does the hen come from"?

"The young lady knows as well as I: a hen comes from an egg."

"Very well, but which of the two existed first? the egg or the hen"?

"I certainly do not know what you want to make of your eggs and your hens; but, in a word, that existed first was the hen." "There was, then a hen which did not come from an egg"?

"Oh! pardon me, miss, I was not paying attention; it was the egg that existed first." "There was, then, an egg which did not come form a hen? answer me, sir."

"Ah—if—pardon me—I mean—because—you see—"

"What I see, sir, is that you do not know whether the egg existed before the hen, or the hen before the egg."

"Well! I say it was the hen."

"Be it so. There was, then, a hen which did not come from an egg. Tell me, now, who created this first hen, from which all other hens and eggs have come"?

"With your hens and your eggs, you seem to take me for a girl from a poultry yard."

"Pardon me, sir, I merely ask you to tell me, whence came the mother of all hens."

"But, to end the matter—"

"Since you do not know, permit me to tell you. He who created the first hen, or the first egg, which ever you please, is the same being that created the world, and we call him God. You cannot, sir, without God explain the existence of an egg or a hen, and yet you pretend, without God, to explain the existence of the world!

The young infidel asked no more questions, he steadily seized his hat, and disappeared. As much ashamed, remarked one of the company, as a fox had been caught by a hen. (Gaume Catechism, Vol. I, Les. III.)

Now, what we say of an egg or a hen we must also repeat of that primeval chaotic or elementary matter, from which some scientists are wont to say, that first the moneron, then all forms of life up to man are derived. For, let it be granted for a moment, that all things came by evolution from that primorial matter or Pradhana; but whence did that matter itself come? Did it exist of itself in virtue of its own essence from all eternity, or did it arise by chance? The first cannot be true, for, if it were so, matter itself would be at the same time God and not God. If matter were self-existent from all eternity it

would be the only and real God, because self-existence as such is the chief characteristic of the Godhead: but at the same time it would not be God, because to change and develop into higher forms is the chief characteristic of material nature as distinct from the unchangeable God. Neither can we say that this primordial matter arose by chance, and that higher forms of existence again by chance developed from it, because every sensible man knows that nothing arises by haphazard, much less a settled order of organic and inorganic beings. Therefore we must conclude that every existing contingent being is derived from God as the self-existent First Cause of the whole Universe.

Likewise we see that all things in the world are respectively to one another, causes and effects, so as to form an uninterrupted chain or series of contingent beings. But from whom will the first link of the chain be but from God? On whom consequently will the whole succession or train of things depend but on God the creator of that first being that headed the series or succession, the creator of the first link that started the chain. God from nothing created the first man, the first animal, the first tree, the first herb, the first element of matter, the first atom, the aggregation of which has formed the plastic root of the material world.

God infinite.

God therefore is the first cause or the creative power and energy of the Universe: and as such He is infinite. God is an infinite Being, without bounds, without limits of any kind whatever. There exists no perfection in the spiritual and material world that is not found in Him, just as there is no drop of water in the rivulet that is not found in its mother spring, no perfume in the air that is not found in the flower, no light in the atmosphere that is not found in the sun. All creatures outside of God are limited to one species, to one kind of things, or at least to the perfections of one individual. A tree has not the perfections of an animal, an animal has not the perfections of man, man has not the perfections of pure spirits, a spirit has not, at least, the perfections proper to the whole community of spiritual Beings. But not so with God. God is the unlimited the never-fading source of all possible perfection, and as such in his simple unity he comprehends either formally all perfections that severally are the characteristics of all creatures.

God a simple spiritual Being.

God is infinite yet his infinitude does not exclude the most perfect simplicity. God is infinite, namely, his Being has no limits as to perfection: not as to matter. God eminently precontains in His most simple Being all perfection that is included in matter, just as a golden coin includes all value contained in a silver coin, not being silver itself: just as man contains all the vegetative powers of the vegetable kingdom, himself not being a vegetable. On the other hand, infinitude as to matter involves contradiction, because the infinite cannot be measured and matter is measurable, the infinite cannot be greater or lesser and matter is divisible in different proportions, finally matter is necessarily limited by three dimensions without which not only it cannot exist nay, even it is altogether inconceivable. Regarding therefore God's infinitude, perfection not matter, it may be easily understood how God is an infinite spiritual Being, and yet simple. For, what is composed has parts and is capable of division into parts. But parts must exist before they can be put together, or at least may be thought of as existing before they combine together to make the whole they are destined to. But if the parts must exist before they are put together, they are prior to the whole, and must have a cause of their union. Building materials are not the house, and they exist prior to the house, and require an architect, namely a cause of their combination, and orderly arrangement. But who will assert that something is prior to the first cause? Who will venture to affirm that some one stands to the first and self existent Being in the relation of maker or architect of his existence? Is it not this a flat contradiction? Therefore let us conclude. God the most high is a spiritual, personal, self-existent, infinite, simple Being.

God immense.

God being infinite, it follows that He is immense, namely without limits of any sort as to space. God is above any boundary of space, namely, is Immense, because by his activity God is present everywhere and by his incorporeal presence He is wholly everywhere. In virtue of this perfection, God exists everywhere in space, without consisting of parts corresponding to parts of space, and without being limited to any extension of space. God exists in corporeal things not being Himself a corporeal Being: God exists in spiritual beings, being Himself infinitely above the rank of any created spirit. He exists everywhere, in His entirety, without suffering the slightest change. He is present to every created thing, and the divine substance is such that it would be present to any possible world, supposing that world to start into existence. He is present everywhere by his presence, power, and essence, therefore we must say that the Divine substance has an existence eminently equivalent to any possible extension whatever of corporeal worlds, namely that God is really immense I reserve for my second lecture on creation to explain more fully the three modes of God's existence in corporeal things, whereby He is said to be in each of them, "by essence, presence, and power."

G. Bartoli, s. j., d. d.

(*To be continued.*)

CAMEOS FROM TAMIL LITERATURE.

1. வறியவ னிளமைபோல் வாடிய சினையவாய்
சிறியவன் செல்வம்போற் சேர்ந்தார்க்கு நிழலின்றி
யார்கண்ணு மிகந்துசெய் திசைகெட்டா னிறுதிபோல்
வேரொடு மரம்வெம்ப விரிகதிர் தெறுதலி
னலவுற்றுக் குடிகூவ வாறின்றிப் பொருள்வெஃகிக்
கொலையஞ்சா வினைவராற் கோல்கோடி யவனிழ
லுலகுபோ லுலறிய வுயர்மர வெஞ்சுரம்;

இடைகொண்டு பொருள்வயி னிறத்திநீ யெனக்கேட்பி
னுடைபுநெஞ் சுகவாங்கே யொளியோடற் பாண்மன்னோ
படையமை சேக்கையுட் பாயலி னறியாய்நீ
புடைபெயர்வா யாயினும் புலம்புகொண் டினைபவள்.

முனிவின்றி முயல்பொருட் கிறத்திநீ யெனக்கேட்பி
பனியகண் படலொல்லா படர்கூர்கிற் பாண்மன்னோ
நனிகொண்ட சாயலா ணயந்துநீ நகையாகத்
துனிசெய்து நீடினுந் துறப்பஞ்சிக் கலுழ்பவள்.

பொருணோக்கிப் பிரிந்துநீ போகுதியெனக் கேட்பின்
மருணோக்க மழிந்தாங்கே மயல்கூர்கிற் பாண்மன்னோ
விருணோக்க மிடையின்றி யீரத்தி னியன்றநின்
னருணோக்க மழியினு மவலங்கொண் டழிபவள்

எனவாங்கு,

வினைவெஃகி நீசெலின் விடுமிவ ளுயிரெனப்
புனையிழாய் நின்னிலை யான்கூறப் பையென
நிலவுவே னெடுந்தகை நீளிடைச்
செலவொழிந் தன்னாற் செறிகநின் வளையே

2. அறிதாய வறனெய்தி யருளியோர்க் களித்தலும்
பெரிதாய பகைவென்று பேணாரைத் தெறுதலும்
புரிவமர் காதலிற் புணர்ச்சியுந் தருமெனப்
பிரிவெண்ணிப் பொருள்வயிற் சென்றநங் காதலர்
வருவர்கொல் வயங்கிழாய் வலிப்பல்யான் கேளினி;

அடிதாங்கு மளவின்றி யனலன்ன வெம்மையாற்
கடியவே கனங்குழாய் காடென்றா ரக்காட்டுட்
டுடியடிக் கயந்தலை கலக்கிய சின்னீரைப்
பிடியூட்டிப் பின்னுண்ணுங் களிறெனவு முரைத்தனரே;

இன்பத்தி னிகந்தோரீஇ யிலைதீந்த வுலவையாற்
றுன்புறூஉந் தகையவே காடென்றா ரக்காட்டு
ளன்புகொண் மடப்பெடை யசைஇய வருத்தத்தை
மென்சிறக ராலாற்றும் புறவெனவு முரைத்தனரே;

கன்மிசை வேய்வாடக் கனைகதிர் தெறுதலாற்
றுன்னரூஉந் தகையவே காடென்றா ரக்காட்டு
ளின்னிழ லின்மையான் வருந்திய மடப்பிணைக்குத் [ரே;
தன்னிழலைக் கொடுத்தளிக்குங் கலையெனவு முரைத்தன

எனவாங்கு,

1. *The Maid to her Master* :—

" The branches droop like the youth of the poor
And no shelter afford, like the lowly miser's hoard,
The tree withers to the root, as when the evil-doer
Shorn of all fame, nears his bitter end.
With the fierce heat of the burning sun, stricken sore
Like the country under the shelter of the unjust king,
Fleeced without scruple by his ministers, despite the people's cries,
In such arid desert, stand the tall trees bare.

" Of your crossing such desert, on gain intent, if she hears,
Will not her heart break and the light flee from her eye ?
She, you know, will bemoan her loss, on the downy bed,
If even unconscious, you roll away from her arms.

" Of your cruel separation on gain intent, if she hears,
Will her eyes find sleep, without overflowing with tears?
She, you know, will indulge in cry, your beautiful wife,
If even in play, you were absent, a moment more.

" Of your journey in quest of gold, if she hears
Will not she lose her dazzling beauty and plunge in sorrow ?
She, you know, will make herself greatly miserable,
If even, for a moment, love should not lighten your brow."

Maid to her Lady :—

" You part from her and she parts her life, I said,
Anon, your noble lover with the bright spear, his journey dropped
Therefore, my dear, put on your bangles tight."

(*Kalitogai* No. 10).

2. *The lady to her Maid* :—

Giving in rare charity to those who come beseeching,
His foes, by a victor's strength, subduing,
And living in a union of love, formed in former life
Thinking these his duty, my lover who left in search of wealth,
Will he return soon, you think, my dear ; I think so, now hear.

" Hot like fire, untroddable
So severe is the desert, my dear," said he ; " In this desert,
The water, made muddy by the thoughtless young elephant,
Making his mate drink first, the male elephant would drink after," said he.

" Devoid of pleasure, the leafage being withered and gone,
The desert is simply woe-begone, my dear," said he ;
" In such a desert,
The pain, undergone by its loving young mate,
The dove alleviates by flapping its wings," said he.

" On the hills, the bamboos droop and die, the sun scorches so,
And so difficult of approach is the desert, my dear," said he ;
" In such a desert
The young deer, suffering for want of shelter,
Her mate protects under his own shadow," said he

இனைநல முடைய கானஞ் சென்றோர்
புனைநலம் வாட்டுந ரல்லர் மனைவயிற்
பல்லியும் பாங்கொத் திசைத்தன
நல்லெழி லுண்கணு மாடுமா லிடனே

The desert, possessing such loving remembrances,
My partner will not bear to see suffer long,
Hark! The lizard did speak from the right quarter
And lo! My beautiful eyelids on the left flutter.
(*Kalitogai* No. 11.)

KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page 44*).

In the case of the author who composed and completed his Ramayan in a fortnight, bad syntax in some places is allowable and excusable. But his indulgence in poetical license is unprecedented. Some of his words bear the stamp of bold grammatical coinage. That he cared very little for strict grammatical accuracy the very first line gives evidence. "உலகம்யாவையுந்தா முளவாக்கலும்" has no மோனை (alliteration). In the stanza "நாடியபொருள் &c.," the first two and the fourth sentences end with a தன்வினை, while the third ends with a பிறவினை. In the stanza "ஓசைபெற்றுயர் &c.," "Kamban makes a blunder with நக்குபு using it as an infinitive instead of as the past participle. நக்குபு means நக்கி and not நக்க as Kamban would have it to mean." (Mr. Sundaram Pillai in the *Christian College Magazine*). In the 17th stanza "பாரின்பால் &c.," of வேள்வி Balakandam என்பான் according to some scholars is அசை. But others only force a meaning upon என்பான். He uses பிரதம் for பிரேதம் (133 பள்ளியடை-அயோத்) and மானுயர் for மானுடர் (50 நிந்தனைப்படலம்-சுந்தர) on account of rhyme (எதுகை). நன்றாயிற்றன்றோ is "நன்றாய்த்தன்றோ" in stanza 66 நகர்நீங்குதல் (அயோத்). தாய்தந்தை + என்ன is contracted into தாய்தந்தென்ன in 29. கைகேசிசூழ்வினை (அயோத்), லோபேன் is எதிர்மறைத்தன்மை வினைமுற்று of sanskrit லோபம (ஒன்றும் லோபேன் 7 கைகேசிசூழ்வினை) and this a very bold conjugation. என்றலில் is of the 7th case in தோன்றல் நீ &c. 24 அகத்தியப்படலம் of ஆரணியகாண்டம். ஓடும் is இசைநிறை in சேற்றடங்கட்டிரு வோடும் நீங்கியபாற்றடங் கடல 37 பள்ளியடை. மூவரினால் வராமுனி வந்தெய்தினான் (5 மந்திரப்படலம் of அயோத்) is badly elliptical. It cannot be adapted to grammar unless it be expanded into something like this மூவருடனே சேர்த்தெண்ணி நால்வர் என்று சொல்லாகும் முனிவந்தெய்தினான். No modern poet will make bold to coin an adjective ஓம from ஓம் as in ஓமராமரை (31 விராதன்வதை) note also பிறத்து for பிறப்பித்து (37 மந்திரப்படலம்). Rev. Beschi in sutram No. 7, section சாலவுரிமை of பொருளதிகாரம் (ஐந்திலக்கணத்தொன்னூல் விளக்கம்) draws attention to the confusion of (பருவமயக்கம்) கார் and கூதிர் in the Kishkindakanda but justifies the same as it is a compound of two consecutive and closely related seasons. Want of space and time forbids us from doing full justice to the grammar of Kamban. We are, however, of opinion that a short manual explaining the peculiarities of Kamban's grammar will be useful in the hands of Pandits and students.

We are also of opinion that this may form the appendix of a glossary explaining the peculiar meanings which the words and phrases convey here and there in Kamban's Ramayanam. In hundreds of lines our ordinary dictionary will be no true help in the hands of a pandit or student preparing his lesson. In the 2nd line of stanza 8 of மந்திரப்படலம் நூலறநோக்கித் தெய்வ துணிந்தறந்துணிந்த மேலோர் தெய்வம் means ஊழ் (fate). In ஒருத்தலைப் பாத்தொருத்தலைப் பங்குவினூர்தி (66 மந்திரப்படலம் அயோத்) the 1st ஒருத்தலை means ஒருபக்கத்தில் and the 2nd means நிச்சயமாக. "மாலம் in தாறின் ஏலமும் மாலமும் தொடர்தருசாரல்" (2) சித்திரகூடம் is தமாலம்=குங்குமமாம். அசை means கட்டு in அடையவாரி அரவால் அசை அனேகவித அம் (10 விராதன்). அனை means அனல் and புனை means புனல் in 4 அகத்தியப்படலம். குற்றபாகு means அரிபிளவு in 29 நாட்டுப்படலம். There is no necessity here for multiplying such examples. Those who have had any experience with Kamban will feel this want. Kamban makes so many words and phrases serve his purpose in so many places that even the context cannot give us the clue in many instances. When some of the pandits who are supposed to have read deeply the Ramayana are dead, many of the passages will become obscure. The Ramayana serves as a valuable text in the higher classes and it is indispensable that at least the educational authorities should take upon their shoulders the accomplishment of this most useful though laborious task.

A few mannerisms we have noted in a persual of Kamban may be briefly stated to be the repetition of the form எழொடேழ் and ஐந்தொடைந்து, his frequent reference to the tender affection of the cow to its calf, and his frequent allusion to the meaningless love of

harlots in places referring to meanness. One more of this class is the comparison of the swiftness of the arrow to the immediate effect of the curse of sages and rishis.

The bright side of the picture:—Let us now turn for a brief view of the bright side of the picture. The most noteworthy feature is the use of the most *sublime and very apt similes* in the Ramayana. To examine even a greater part of them will be impossible here. We will only refer to some. The river Ganges takes its source at one place in the Himalayas, ramifies into many branches and enters the sea by one mouth, even as the first cause of the world is one, who is spoken of as different deities by the different religions, though, in the last resort, they all tend towards the selfsame first cause. (19 ஆற்றுப்படலம்). Dasaratha reigned his country as carefully as a poor peasant watches his field (12 அரசியல்). Rama's arrow pierced through the throat of தாடகை, and away it went like a valuable lesson given to the vulgar (72-தாடகைவதை). The king's ministers when they heard of Dasaratha's resolve on a life of penance and of the installation of Rama were in the state of a cow between its two calves. (32-மந்திரப்படலம்). The face of Rama, when he was ordered by Kaikeyi to go to the wilderness, appeared better than the lotus which blossomed just at the time. (108-கைகேசி சூழ்வினை). When the army of Bharata was going to overtake Rama in the woods, the silence of their trumpets resembled the silence of the wise in the midst of the foolish vulgar. (33-ஆற்றுப்படலம்). The water of the tank பம்பை was as clear and deep as the thought embodied in the numbers of great poets. In the 8th stanza of வரைக்காட்சி-the golden wheels of chariots which rolled on the roads over the base of சந்திரசைலம் gave a golden hue to the rocks underneath, even as the great sages, when they mingle with the low, change their folly. In the 20th *ibid*, the horses, when they got up, after rolling on the ground, shook the dust off their bodies, just as the good, when they come to know the evil nature of those whom they befriend, forsake their company.

There are innumerable passages where a word or a phrase produces an effect not so much by what it expresses as by what it suggests, not so much by the ideas which it directly conveys as by other ideas which are connected with them. For instance in the 49th stanza of விராதன்வதை of Aranyakanda

> கடுத்தகாரம் கதுவநிமிர் சுடெடுத்து மெய்சலங்கி
> உடுத்ததிசை அனைத்தினும் சென்றொல்கொள்ள உறுதுயரால்
> அடுத்த பொருந்தனி மூலத்தரும் பரமேபரமே என்
> றெடுத்தொருவாரணமழைக்கநீயோஅன்றேஎன் என்றாய்

the word என் signifies simply *what* But it suggests that other deities were all silent because they are not all pervading whereas the god addressed here being omnipresent replied as soon as he was called. It also suggests that the deity as *protector* of the universe cares more than others for the miseries of all living creatures. It also suggests the readiness with which he complies with the requests of the suffering. In the 126th stanza of கிளைகண்டுநீங்குதல் of Ayodhyakanda

> சான்றவர்ஆகதன் குரவர் ஆகதாய்
> போன்றவர் ஆகமெய்ப் புதல்வர் ஆகதான்
> தேன்றருமலருளான் சிறுவ செய்வென் என்
> றேன்றபின் அவ்வுரைமறுக்கும் ஈட்டதோ

Rama addresses Vasishta as the son of Brahma. But the implication is that "you are only a boy and you have yet to appreciate the sacredness of a promise." In the 87th stanza of the same padalam.

> கன்னகுதிரள்புயக் கணவன்பின் செல
> நன்னகர்ஒத்தது நடந்தகானமும்
> மன்னவன்துஞ்சினன் என்ற மாற்றத்தால்
> அன்னமும்துயர்கடல் அடிவைத்தாள் அரோ

As long as Dasaratha was alive, even forest life was city life to Seetha. Now that she heard of his death she stepped into the sea of misery. The phrase அடிவைத்தாள் suggests that she knew no misery up to that moment and that she had yet miseries in store to pass through. This strikes a clear note to her future miseries. In the 28th stanza of கைகேசிசூழ்வினை of the same kanda "கண்ணே வேண்டுமே * * * மண்ணே கொள் நீ மற்றையது ஒன்றும் மறவென்றான்," the word மண் as per context means *earth*. The word here carries along with it an idea implying *scorn*: What you want is only mud. You can very well have it being but mud: (but in the other, my life is entered)." In the last stanza of குலமுறை கிளத்துபடலம் of Balakandam we have

> "கோதமன்றன் பன்னிக்கு முன்னையுருக் கொடுத்ததிவன்
> போதுநின்ற தெனப்பொலிந்த பொலன்கழற்காற் பொடிகண்டாய்."

Here பொடி of course means *dust*. But the inference is :—If the mere dust of Rama's feet can execute such wonder, what then of his feet and other limbs. By

this Viswamithra produces in the mind of Janaka a very strong impression in favor of Rama, and gives him to understand that there cannot come another personage capable of handling the bow which is to decide the fate of Seeta. In the 40th stanza of வேள்விப்படலம் of the same kanda "எண்ணுதற்...முனிவன் வேள்வியை......மன்னன் மைந்தர்கள் கண்ணிணைக்காக்கின்ற இமையிற் காத்தனர்" the simile of course simply shows how carefully the brothers guarded the sacrifice. But the simile suggests how the brothers made a division of labour among them of the duty of guarding the sacrifice. The younger brother was guarding it from a place standing still like the lower eyelid, while the elder Rama was moving to and fro like the upper eyelid. What we have given are only some of the philosopher's stones doing duty in the hands of Kamban. Substitute another word or phrase, the magic is gone. There will only be a pebble.

Kamban sometimes plays upon words and they are very charming. "விந்தையெனும் விண்தோய், நாகமது நாகமுறநாகமெனநின்றான்" (39-அகத்தியப்படலம்). நவன் செயத்தகைய இந்நளின நாட்டத்தான், தவன்செயத்தவன் செய்ததவன் என் என்கின்றாள்" (18-சூர்ப்பநகை). "தையலார், உடையுயிர்யாவையும் உடையுமால் என்றாள்" (23 *ibid*). "உள்ளமே துப்பெனில் துப்புடையாதைச் சொல்லுகேன்" (21 *ibid*). "வெள்ளியையாதல் விளம்பினை" &c. (29-வேள்வி)—play upon வெள்ளி (சுக்கிரன்) the minister of Mahabali. "ராகமடங்கலு மால்விடையும் பொன், நாகமு நாகமு நாணநடந்தான்" (32-கார்முகம்)—"விலங்கானேனுதலினால் விலங்கினேன்" (22-சடாயு).

He has a command of very happy metaphors :—

"நீளிருங் களங்க நீக்கி நிரைமணி மாட நெற்றிச், சாளரந் தோறுந் தோன்றுஞ் சந்திரவுதயங் கண்டார்" (மிதிலைக்காட்சி-14) களிப்பினை யுணர்த்துஞ் செவ்விக் கமலங்கள்பலவுங் கண்டார் (*ibid* 15.) சாளரத்தினும் பூத்தன தாமரை மலர்ள் (மந்திரப்படலம்-54). "மந்திரக் கிழவர்தம் முகத்தால்,r, எழுதிநீட்டிய விங்கித மிறைமகற் கேற்றி (*ibid*-45) "வெந்திறல் அரக்கர் விடவேர் முதலறுப்பான், வந்தனன் மருத்துவன் எனத்தனிவலிப்பான் ("44-அகத்தியப்படலம்). "துன்னுதாள் வளம் சுமந்ததாழையில் பன்னுவான் குலைப்பதடியாயினேன்" (134-பள்ளியடைப்படலம்).

T. CHELVAKESAVARAYA MUDALIAR, M. A.

(*To be continued*).

EXTRACT.

The following reviews, we extract from the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* :—

1. *Sivagnana Botham of Meikanda-Deva.* Translated with notes and introduction, by J. M. NALLASWAMY PILLAY, B. A., B. L., District Munsiff. It is impossible to do more than announce the publication of this translation of the most important Tamil philosophical work known in the South. It contains a good deal of Tamil, and the supposed Sanskrit original of the fundamental principles of the system. The notes are exhaustive, but we rather think will be most valued by that reader who can compare the Tamil Text and Commentary with the learned author's own exposition. We acknowledge to having given some laborious, but pleasant, years to pondering this treatise and books connected with it. There are in in it very great truths, mingled with equally great errors both philosophical and religious. If our Tamil friends can be content to view it as a contribution towards the study of philosophy, and can believe that all truth is really one, and is developed from age to age, and that every system must learn to throw off from time to time its worn-out garments, it will be well for them. The editor is angry * with some recent writers who believe that the intercourse with the western world, which the Tamil people had from even before the first century of the Christian era, had influenced and materially modified their writings and systems. A tree is dead when it ceases to imbibe and absorb the influences of the soil and the atmosphere in which it flourishes. There is a subtle interpenetration of philosophical truths which makes every succeeding philosophy the child of all that has preceded it. Tamil philosophy has much to cast off, as much to recast; but its interest and importance can only be denied by the ignorant.

2. *Meykanda Sattiram*—The Text (with commentary) of 15 treatises on the fundamental Doctrines of the Saiva-Siddhanta System, edited by Nagalinga Muthaliar of Kanji (Conjeevaram); pp. 864. We have not space for even the names of all the treatises included in this bulky volume. In fact it contains, in somewhat difficult verse, the whole of the text books of the latest philosophy of the South Indian Saiva school; and to find anything analogous to it we shall have to go to the writings of the Schoolmen in the Middle Ages. The founder of the school, if we may so call it, was Meykanda-Devar, whose history, or rather legend, we should like to give. He is said to have derived his philosophy from the Sanskrit *Agamas*, and to have reduced it to twelve great aphorisms, which are in fact the texts which all the writers in this volume expound. But, as far as we know, no Sanskrit originals have been published (or found) to anything but the aphorisms themselves,—which however are supposed in the legend to have been composed in Tamil! Concerning these *Agamas* there is a profound mystery, in more ways than one. One of these works is the Siva-Pragasam

* The editor informs us that he feels surprised at this charge. The only sentence in the preface that can give room to this charge is the following. "But the deeply implanted prejudice lingers, and it leads him to say that truth found in the Kural must have been derived from a Christian source." There is nothing savouring of anger in this remark, but it only refers to the hobby of most Christians that wherever anything good is found, whether before or after Christ should be derived from a Christian source, and it is to correct this feeling, the Rev. G. M. Cobban wrote in the *Contemporary Review*- And the editor was quite agreed with the latter Rev. Gentleman to acknowledge truth wherever it might be found. The question however in one of pure historical importance but when we have no proper historical data, none need be in any way dogmatic about the question whether the East or West has received influences from the other; but in all probability both have benefited by the mutual contact.

by the great Umapathi, who is also the author of four or five of the very best of the series. He lived in the neighbourhood of Chidambaram, and belongs (as a date in his work shows) to the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The most notable matter, we think, in the whole system is the emphasis laid upon the absolute necessity for the reincarnation of Siva in the person of the consummate GURU, or Divine Teacher. The necessity for a divinely-imparted gift of enlightening and sanctifying Grace is insisted upon, in a very curious series of types, myths and legends. To an Englishman wishing to know what South India thinks and feels on the highest subjects, this work (and the ability to read it) is indispensable.

3. *The History of Manikka Vacagar, the Foe of the Buddhists.* This is the title of a pamphlet of some sixty pages, containing a paper read by Dr. G. U. Pope, of Balliol College, Oxford, before that institute. The paper itself is contained in about eighteen pages, and the remainder of the pamphlet is occupied with a discussion thereupon by those who were present and heard it read; this is followed by a lengthy appendix, containing very much that is valuable alike from a critial, historical, and religious point of view,—a remark which applies also to the numerous footnotes which accompany the Lecture throughout. For a great many years the contributions of Dr. Pope to the *Indian Antiquary* and other learned periodicals have familiarized all lovers of Oriental research with his profound learning and literary enthusiasm. Everything therefore, which proceeds from his pen must be deserving of careful attention. In the present lecture he gives an elaborate account of the sage Manikya: commencing with the sage's history prior to his "conversion" and with the events which led up to it, Dr. Pope proceeds to the narrative of the manner of that event, and then passes on to an account of the sage's doctrine and of his manner of life as a teacher. The work is well written, and is admirably calculated to assist missionaries and all who are desirous of thoroughly understanding the nature of Buddhism and the conflict of an earnest-minded Oriental in the investigation of its claims upon human acceptance. Of course, it is in its very nature a more or less religious work; but it is on the subject of religion that all Orientals are most interesting: all their literary productions are inspired with the religious-spirit and gather round this as their prime centre; for the Oriental, and especially the Indian. is nothing if not religious. Apart, however, from this, the pamphlet is full of matter which will well repay the attention of the antiquary, the linguist, and the historian.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

A Tamil changam.—A Tamil changam is to be formed at Kumbakonam, under the auspices of His Holiness the Pandara Sannadhigal of Thiruvavaduthurai, who in promissing his support, desires the co-operation of all the well-to-do mirasidars and native gentry of the district. And no doubt he is right. It has of late been the practice to expect that some of these things should be done by some people and some people alone. When such hope prevails it is a sure sign that nothing will be done. The duty is on all, and self-help ought to be their motto. When each one tries to do his duty, it would be time enough to find fault with others, even though these latter may be expected in a greater measure to take the initative in such matters. We fervently hope that the projected *changam* will be an accomplished fact ere long.

***

Loyalty of the Tamil People.—We referred to the loyalty of the Indian people, in our review of the D. K. agency publication of the Life of Her Majesty. The Rev. Dr. G. U. Pope, in his review in the *Indian Magazine and Review* for July pays a graceful compliment to the loyalty of the Tamil people. He says "The Tamil people have always been loyal. The Tamil sepoys have yielded to none in bravery; and it may safely be said that the hearts of the 16 millions who speak the Tamil language are full of the most reverential and affectionate regard for their great mother. This makes the publication of this graphic and well-written book most fitting."

***

IN the forthcoming October Number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Dr. Pope reviews some more of the Poets of the Tamil lands. The serial No. 6, notices the *Naladinannuru, Tirikiadugam, Elathi, Nanneri, Ciru-Panja-Mulam, Paramori, Nithi-neri-villakkam*: and in his summary, this veteran Tamil Scholar points out the originality of ancient Tamil verse, and the excellence of the subjects dealt with by the Tamil gnomic poets, and their influence on the character of the people, and observes, that "it is therefore to be desired that in Schools and Colleges, the study of classical Tamil should be maintained. These quatrains are a well of good, old, strong, wholesome Tamil. They are calculated to strengthen and invigorate the character of the people. It is never good for a race to forget its old genuine literature."

***

In the correspondence we published from the Rev. Father G. Bartoli in our last, we beg to differ from the learned Father, about his estimate of Gita, that it follows the Vedanta theory. This is the common fallacy, created by the fact of the great use made of the book by Vedantists. But it is not so, and it was only some time back, that a learned professor and joint editor of a Vedanta magazine confessed that the Gita does not certainly postulate the identity of the Human and Supreme Spirit, and the Maya theory itself finds no place anywhere, the word itself occurs in two or three places only, but even then, it means not illusion but power on creative power only; and the *Brahmavadin* admits that "it is rather difficult to evolve out of it the later Vedantic sense." (p. 297, Vol. I). The description of God, "as the Supporter, Spectator and Seer &c." which our learned correspondent approves is also found in the Gita, (chapter13,22,) and of course is a quotation from the Svetaswatara Upanishad, and it is a remarkable fact that the Gita contains more quotations from the Svetaswatara than from any other Upanishad. The expression 'Sat and Asat,' and neither Sat nor Asat has been growly misunderstood by almost every writer, though the real meaning has been very clearly pointed by Mr. Davies, in his 'Hindu Philosophy' (Trubner's) note B. p. 135. The phrase does not mean existence, *per se* and non-existence, but manifested, or developed, Pratiaksha, and unmanifested or undeveloped, Apratiatcha or Avyakta. If in every place, the phrase occurs, this meaning is read into it, the whole passage is as clear and

unambiguous as anything. We hope to extract the whole note, which is a very learned one in our next.

***

The quotation from Boedder is very beautiful and true, and God's nature is compared to that of the Sun, illuminating itself, by that very light, with which it lightens up the whole world. The single word, *Svam paraprakasam* conveys the whole meaning. (*c.f.* p. 60 Sivgananabotham).

***

Srirangakshetra Mahatvam.—The learned Editor of the *Crescent* has added this sketch of the most important temple of the south, to his large collection of descriptive sketches of various shrines. The sketch is an exhaustive one, giving as it does, the old puranic traditions, connected with the origin of the temple and its various shrines, the history of the various endowments attached to the temple, and its condition in medæval and modern times. with a brief account of the various festivals held during the year. The temple is chiefly famous for its association with most of the *Alwars* of the Vaishnavite faith, and the sketch deals with them also in brief. Of course, the antiquity attributed to the temple and its connection with Rama and Lakshmana cannot be treated seriously, and the brief account of the various builders of the temple and its different portions as gathered from the inscriptions is defective for want of proper dates, if they were available.

***

THE *Indian Social Reformer* says:—

"The current number of the *Siddhanta Deepika* has some observations on our leader on "Vernacular Studies in Madras." We have been the first to admit as will be seen from the back numbers of the *Reformer* that the Brahmans had not their own way in all things in Southern India. Refer to our notes on *Kapila*, the Tamil poet, for an illustration. What we do hold, however, is that as far as the hold of the Brahmans became stronger on the people, as it has apparently unaccountably been doing since the advent of the British rule, the development of vernacular literature in South India was checked. *We were referring to recent times and present conditions and not to the ancient or middle ages.*"

The italics are ours. The *Reformer* proceeds to out gratuitously enough who the Tamil Agastya *was not*, and refers very kindly to our credulity in believing him to be the author of several hymns in the first mandala of the Rig Veda; and in indulging in this irrelevancy, he has forgot to answer the main question, we put, "Why did the Tamilians themselves neglected their own mother-tongue?"

***

THE question which our contemporary asked in his leader was "why is it that with far less encouragement from the University in Bombay, the vernaculars there grow and thrive, while with far greater encouragement, from our University, they tend to decay?", and the poser he put was, "are the advocates of greater official encouragement, being given to vernacular studies prepared to face it." And we had better quote the whole of the following few sentences, as our contemporary has apparently forgotten the same:—

"We are afraid they are not. Even the mention of it may be unpalatable to some. But it had better be told, if at least for the purpose of preventing wild hopes being entertained of the outcome of the several proposals that have been put forward. The fact is, in this Presidency, or over the greater part of it, the literary class, the Brahmins, have never owned, though they had adopted, the vernaculars as their mother-tongue. How many of the Tamil classics are the work of Brahmins? There may be an exceptional scholar here and there like Mr. Swaminatha Iyer of Kumbakonam, who has consistently stood up for the superiority of the Tamil language *But the majority of the literary class, which unfortunately has always managed to be the sole literate class also, recognised no devoir to the Tamil language.*"

The italics are ours, and we would ask our contemporary to read these sentences together, and see, note and digest, if they mean the same thing. "*Always*," can it refer merely to 'recent times and modern conditions'; and the Brahmans, 'the sole literate class,' include the people, who "had a highly organized society and a well-developed language." No doubt, our contemporary did write the last clause but it is only human nature which conveniently sacrifices facts, when they cannot serve one's theory. Our contemporary was so far carried away by his theory (we admitted his theory was partially correct but did not meet all the facts and so had no reason to crow over the advocates of greater official encouragement), that he forgot facts known to himself. We don't wish to be hard on our contemporary, but as a *Reformer*, while charging others with credulity, he has to be more careful of *his own facts* and *theories*.

***

As regards, the difference, of encouragement accorded to vernacular studies by our two Universities, we should think they count little. We believe our contemporary is a professed utilitarian, and the common people who have bellies to take care of are greater utilitarians than he. Our contemporary must have heard the people talk of ஊண்பாடம் (bread-studies), and with this feeling of gross materiality on the subject, our contemporary cannot expect them to avail themselves of the facilities afforded by our *alma mater*, when such distinction cannot pay. (We know what pay, a distinguished Master of Arts in the vernacular subjects is getting). What are the facilities pray? The subject is one of so many to be learnt, and a mastery of the English language is essential for all other subjects, and the study of the vernacular is as such narrowed, limited and crushed by want of scope and encouragement and inducement.

***

We have no desire to pursue the subject any further, but in passing we may remark, the position of Sanskrit stands not much better than the vernaculars, in spite of the great revivalistic stimulus. And the Hon'ble Dr. Duncan had as much the Sanskrit in mind, as the vernaculars, when he made his first proposals, and bewailed of the decay of the Pandit class, which fact we also referred to, just above the notice of our contemporary's views. The question on which our former question was based, is why should the Pandit class (Sanskrit and Tamil) die out?

***

For want of space we postpone the consideration of the question of who our Agastya is to our next.

***

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. KALLIANA SUNDARA NADAR, at the C. N. PRESS, 39, Godown Street, Black Town, and Published by J. M. NAGARATHNAM.